DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 438 569 CS 510 231

AUTHOR Soukup, Paul A.
TITLE Assessing Service-Learning in a Communication Curriculum.
PUB DATE 1999-11-00
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (85th, Chicago, Illinois, November 4-7, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); Educational Assessment; Higher Education; *Individual Development; *Program Effectiveness; *Service Learning; *Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Communications Curriculum; *Community Service

ABSTRACT

Incorporating both educational assessment and service-learning prerogatives, a study examined a communications curriculum implementing service-learning to determine if the service-learning method was accomplishing its full potential. Through an evaluation based on six categories of service-learning objectives (intellectual-, skills, and affective development, moral and spiritual growth, community outcomes and college or university outcomes), a secondary analysis of data collected by Santa Clara University's Eastside Project was undertaken. The analysis included narrative and survey evaluations from 1990-1993 and 1995-1999 from students participating in service-learning placements in conjunction with communication courses. Results indicated that: (1) students make connections to their learning, but at different levels; (2) emotional growth from service-learning includes self-esteem, a sense of being appreciated, and satisfaction; (3) empathy for those served and better ability to relate to others arise from the service-learning experience; (4) a changed outlook on others, on education, and on life may result from the experience; (5) suggestions for improvement and spots of program failure can be noted in student responses; (6) the value of the service-learning experience and its influence on students' future behavior is noticeable; (7) the connection with student academics is present though less prevalent than other assessment variables; and (8) more successful results come in applied courses such as journalism, reporting, and documentary video than in introductory courses. Findings suggest that: faculty implementation of the service-learning model needs improvement; faculty should explore ways to measure whether a service-learning placement helps in skills and in affective development; data collecting methods have been inconsistent and often incomparable; students often feel over-evaluated; and the service-learning program does have a good proportion of successes. Contains 3 tables of data. Appendixes include a sample student evaluation form, placement-based assessment form, and sample program evaluation forms. (EF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 438 569

Assessing Service-Learning in a Communication Curriculum

Paul A. Soukup, SJ
Communication Department
Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, CA 95053
(408) 554-4022
psoukup@scu.edu

Paper presented at the 85th annual meeting of the National Communication Association
Chicago, Il
November 1999

CS 510 231

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Soukup
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Assessing Service Learning in a Communication Curriculum

As a kind of experiential education, service-learning places the student in the larger civic community, usually in a situation where the student engages in work that provides both an educational outcome and a benefit to the community. Lillian Stephens' definition outlines the key elements of this pedagogical approach:

> Service-learning is a merger of community service and classroom learning that strengthens both and generates a whole greater than the sum of its parts. Service is improved by being anchored in the curriculum and learning is deepened by utilizing the community as a laboratory for the classroom where students can test and apply their curriculum to real-life situations. (1995, p. 10)

Barbara Jacoby offers a complementary definition:

> Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning. (1996, p. 5)

The service-learning model incorporates classroom experience, community experience, and reflection that applies classroom theory to community involvement and community reality to classroom lessons.

Programs of communication study have increasingly embraced service learning. David Droge and Bren Murphy (1999) provide both a comprehensive overview of programs utilizing service-learning and almost a dozen examples of service-learning's application to specific communication courses. Despite the growing excitement about service-learning for communication and the many reports of increased student learning, few have systematically explored whether it accomplishes its full potential. Droge and Murphy include only one essay

that deals with assessing the service-learning project (Bergstrom & Bullis, 1999) and the annotated bibliography that concludes the volume (Fisher, Wechsler, & Kendall, 1999) mentions only four items that deal explicitly with assessment.

Though assessment activities run through all teaching (in the form of examinations or projects–all those things that allow teachers to assign grades to students), an assessment of service-learning should go beyond the basic final grade in a class. In fact, a systematic assessment of service-learning should incorporate lessons from the educational assessment literature as well as from the service-learning literature

Educational Assessment

Assessment combines teaching and research in that it systematically collects and analyzes data to test the hypothesis that students have met pedagogical goals. At the same time it goes beyond this due to the complex nature of the educational process, which finds itself pressed by political, economic, and educational forces, each with its own set of goals (Erwin, 1991, pp. 2-3). Educational assessment must examine not only student learning but also program success. Two strands of definition emerge: (A) "Assessment is the process of defining, selecting, designing, collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and using information to increase students' learning and development" (Erwin, 1991, p. 15). (B) "Three purposes appear most frequently in definitions of evaluation: (1) to render judgments on the worth of a program; (2) to assist decision-makers responsible for deciding policy; and (3) to serve a political function" (Talmadge, 1982, p. 594, quoted in Worthen & Sanders, 1987, p. 24). The second strand picks up the economic and

political factors, while the first highlights the purely educational one. Both strands appear in service-learning programs.

Assessment makes the most sense when individuals or institutions can outline clear educational goals and outcomes. These targets could include mastering a body of knowledge, facts, or concepts; learning how to think critically, understand ideas, or apply concepts; producing academic or artistic products; grasping procedural skills; and developing dispositions and interests (Brookhart, 1999, pp. 10-12). Teachers and administrators may make a further distinction, following Michael Scriven, between formative and summative assessment. The former provides ongoing feedback during the course of a program while the latter occurs at the end, to provide a judgment about a program's overall merit (Worthen & Sanders, 1987, p. 34). All of these things clearly relate to service-learning in that it ambitions multiple goals for at least three constituencies: students, community agencies, and schools. Because assessment best suited to measure student outcomes may not help community groups decide whether to participate in a service-learning project, for example, teachers and program administrators should develop several assessment tools.

The assessment literature suggests that objectives-oriented evaluation or assessment best meets such diverse needs. This involves establishing broad objectives, classifying and defining them in terms of behavioral outcomes, finding situations in which achievement of these goals can be shown, and measuring them through appropriate techniques (Worthen & Sanders, 1987, p. 63). Thomas Angelo and K. Patricia Cross suggest that a cluster or Q-sort analysis works well to focus the goals; they further suggest that educators limit assessment activity to between five and

eight clusters of outcomes (1993, p. 16). Once program participants establish the goals, then they can design methods to test them. The measurement of the accomplishment of these goals can take many forms, most of them already known to teachers: criterion- or norm- or standardized-referenced tests, demonstrations, essays, experiments, group projects, performances, portfolios, and projects (Fischer & King, 1995, pp. 3-4).

Though not explicitly envisioning service-learning assessment, T. Dary Erwin offers some important advice for successfully examining educational outcomes that applies to service-learning. Assessment must involve many people: faculty, administrators, students, off-campus participants, and any other constituent groups (1991, pp. 24-25). Student cooperation is essential, particularly in obtaining their understanding the purposes of the assessment and their willingness to take it seriously, not just for their own grade, but for the long-term benefits of the program (pp. 28-29). Finally, Erwin notes that assessment results do most good when all the constituent groups have access to them and can discuss them.

A successful assessment of service-learning should begin with clearly specified goals, classified in related clusters, and agreed upon by the constituent groups. Each cluster should have clearly identified evaluation measures. Finally evaluation results should be shared and discussed at least among faculty, students, community groups, and service-learning administrators.

Goals for Service-Learning

Most service-learning programs accept a common set of outcome objectives. These include such student-focused goals as enhancing student learning through practical experience,

balancing theory and practice, fostering a sense of caring for others, using skills, promoting growth in civic values, gaining a sense of diversity and multiculturalism, assisting growth in personal relations, building solidarity with underserved groups, learning from the disadvantaged their perspective on the attitudes and values of the dominant society, fostering moral development, and aiding spiritual growth. Other, community-based goals include empowering community groups as places of learning, providing new energy to community services, enabling more services from existing agencies, connecting to new resources, and obtaining more helpers. For colleges and universities, the goals comprise improved student learning, holistic education ("the education of the whole person"), insertion into the civic community, promoting diversity and multiculturalism, and the promotion of social justice (Soukup, 1996).

Communication programs may specify one or more of these. "Using skills" may become speaking before community groups, editing a newsletter, or developing a web site. "Balancing theory and practice" may encompass participant observation in a homeless shelter in order to discover group norms and group formation. "Assisting growth in personal relations" could involve addressing issues of communication apprehension through dialogue with multicultural groups. However expressed, service-learning program goals demand clear articulation.

The goals outlined above can be sorted or categorized into fewer broad outcome objectives. The following example of this process draws on the service-learning program at my own institution. The interpretation of the goals–particularly the emphasis on social justice, solidarity with the underserved members of the community, and the spiritual and moral development of the students–reflects the service-learning program at Santa Clara University;

other schools may omit or add some or other components. Component parts of the categories appear in parentheses after each major goal.

1. Intellectual development of students
   (Enhance understanding of the subject matter, bridge theory and practice, understand other cultures, understand civic problems and goals)
2. Skills development in students
   (Develop writing, speaking, and other forms of expression; practice classroom-taught techniques; experience "real-world" situations)
3. Affective development in students
   (Develop civic values, grow in personal relations, increase empathy, establish multicultural connections)
4. Moral and spiritual growth of students
   (Connect with others, grow in solidarity with underserved groups, understand social justice concerns, see others as peers)
5. Community outcomes
   (Increase numbers of volunteers, provide new services, tap into new resources, develop long-term connections by teaching students)
6. College or University outcomes
   (Forge connections with community, participate in local partnerships, develop social outreach, test new educational model)

Assessing the Goals–A Test Case Study

To examine the feasibility of assessing service learning along these lines, this study undertook a secondary analysis of data collected by Santa Clara University's Eastside Project from 1990 to 1999. The data, originally collected as part of routine student feedback, consists of narrative evaluations from 1990 to 1993 and again from 1995 to 1999; survey evaluations from 1991 to 1993 and from 1995 to 1997.

Participants

For the purposes of this analysis, this study reduced the data set, originally collected from across the university, to those students who participated in service-learning placements in

conjunction with their enrollment in communication courses. Since students voluntarily filled in the various instruments, the data set does not include all students who participated in the service-learning components of their courses. Another limitation emerges from the fact that the Project staff used different instruments in the earlier and later periods.

Students enrolled in communication courses between 1990 and 1999 (N = 577) completed the narrative evaluations at the end of the academic quarter in which they participated. Similarly, in some terms from 1992, 1993, 1995, 1996, and 1997, students (N = 382) also completed survey forms. The university collected no data in 1994.

Instrumentation: Narrative evaluations

Placement options varied, with most communication students working at homeless shelters, day-care centers, tutoring programs, nursing homes, and community centers. The 1990-1993 narrative evaluations (N = 88) consisted of 17 items (see Appendix I for the full set of questions). After demographic questions, the form requested input on why the student chose the placement, the student's role at the placement, surprises in the service-learning project, connections to academic work, understanding of social issues, and suggestions for improving the experience.

The 1995-1997 narrative evaluations (N = 489) used a shorter form (see Appendix II) that students completed at the placement site rather than in the classroom. After the demographic items, the assessment requested information about first impressions, learning, feelings about the people, and connections with course content.

Instrumentation: Survey

The Eastside Project staff used several survey forms during the nine years of data collection. In order to document the kinds of assessment undertaken, I will mention all of the surveys, though only two will be analyzed. The first survey form consisted of 32 items, with nine demographic items and 23 Likert-type scales, mostly focused on social attitudes (see Appendix III). This survey had a pre-test, post-test design. (An unknown number of communication students completed this form; the codebook for the survey was accidentally discarded and data identifiers cannot be reliably reconstructed.) The second survey form consisted of 25 items, four demographic questions plus 21 Likert-type scale items, seeking student opinion about the placement, service-learning, social issues, and the people at the placement (see Appendix IV). Forty-five students enrolled in communication courses completed this survey. Finally, the 1995-1997 survey had 31 items, 14 demographic and 17 Likert-items on similar topics to those in the second survey (see Appendix V). The greatest number of students enrolled in communication courses completed this form (N = 357).

A factor analysis of the 1992-1993 data (using a principal component analysis extraction and a Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization) yielded five factors: the value of the experience and its influence on students' future behavior, the initial experience of the placement, the connection with academics, the value of discussion groups, and value of contact with clients (see Table 1 for the components and the loadings).

Table 1: 1992-1993 survey	**Components**				
	1	2	3	4	5
31. Overall I found this a worthwhile experience	.836				
30. I would recommend placement to others in class	.821				
29. I would return to this placement	.796.				
28. As result of this, I am likely to volunteer in future	.740				
21. My curiosity engaged & I want to learn more	.730				
32. It has deepened my understanding of social issues	.624				
27. I feel more confident interact with others of different backgrounds	.510				
15. The staff was helpful		.849			
12. Orientation helped reduce my anxiety		.810			
13. I felt welcomed at this placement		.716			
11. Orientation helped my understanding of my role		.713			
14. I would have liked more direction at placement		-.574			
22. Placement was enhanced by classroom learning			.912		
19. Placement enhanced my understanding of subject			.874		
18. Understood how experience fits educational goals			.722		
20. This influenced my research and class assignment			.579		
25. Liked discussion groups on subject matter of class				.825	
24. Like discussion groups on improving experience				.781	
23. Discussion groups helped me connect with course				.470	
17. Placement provides sufficient opportunity to interact with clients					.701
16. I thought tasks at this placement worthwhile					.698

A factor analysis of the 1995-1997 data (using a principal component analysis extraction and a Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization) yielded four factors: the value of the experience and its influence on students' future behavior, the connection with academics, the awareness of community and social issues, and the initial experience of the placement (see Table 2 for the components and the loadings).

Table 2: 1995-1997 survey	**Component**			
	1	2	3	4
23. I would recommend this placement	.801			
25. I found this a worthwhile experience	.789			
22. I would return to this placement	.785			
13. I thought the tasks I did were worthwhile	.740			
14. Placement provides sufficient opportunity to interact with clients	.689			
11. I felt welcomed at the placement	.679			
12. The staff was helpful	.675			
16. This experience enhanced my understanding of subject matter of the course		.836		
15. I understood how it fit with goals of class		.772		
17. Experience influenced my research		.646		
19. Placement was enhanced by classroom		.578		
18. Curiosity was engaged to learn more		.567		
20. Feel more confident interacting with those of different backgrounds			.866	
24. Deepened my understanding of social justice issues			.612	

21. More likely to volunteer in future			.530	
10. Orientation reduced my anxieties				.934
9. Orientation helped me understand my role				.923

Instrumentation: Other

In addition to these forms, service-learning participants completed departmental narrative evaluations and, in many cases, kept a journal of their participation. Sadly, the departmental forms did not collect data about the Eastside Project, and faculty returned the student journals at the end of the term without keeping any record beyond the grade. From all this, only some anecdotal material remains.

The Eastside Project staff also compiled another questionnaire that the placement supervisors completed each term. This does not appear in the data set.

Results

Narrative evaluations

The data sets provide information about a variety of topics relevant to the assessment clusters outlined above. An initial reading of the student narrative data shows that the responses highlight five themes: connections with learning, student personal issues, empathy and relating to others, changes in outlook, and program feedback.

Many of the students did make connections with their course material, though in general terms. One student wrote, "[I learned] how the surroundings and media influence the way children grow up and interact with their environment" (34F97). Another commented, "I think

what we have been discussing in class has enhanced/covered what I have been doing. For example, non-verbal communication, hand gestures, etc." (35F97). Others managed to connect the experience to specific skills. "I have applied the placement more towards developing my communication skills" (13S98ii). Yet another felt good about "the fact that I relate a lot of what I am doing through non-verbal and verbal communication. It makes me more aware of what messages I send and how that affects her answers back to me" (16S98).

Sometimes the learning takes a different direction from the class material, but still fulfills the goal of student development. Two journalism students commented on this. "I got to do a lot of one-on-one reporting that was very useful for class (writing news articles)" (50F96). Or "I was able to learn more about homelessness through my class assignments (i.e., interviewing people for stories, etc.)" (55F96). An introductory student who had worked in a senior center applied lessons from both interpersonal and mass communication: "I learned the importance of clear verbal and non-verbal communication. Also, I learned that even though media tends [sic] to picture elderly to be physically frail (which is true), they are not as mentally "frail" as the media depicts [sic]. They are quite on the ball" (40W95B).

But the placements did not automatically lead to learning outcomes. A good number–perhaps 10% to 15%–simply noted that they did not see any value in the service-learning experience. Or, if they saw a value, it was in the volunteer work, but not in any way connected to class. A typical comment of this type takes this form: "Actually, I don't feel any significant connection between the two. When I'm writing in my journal, I feel like I have to find some kind of connection" (18F97). Others were even more blunt. "There was not any academic

knowledge that I could make a direct connection with my experience" (119A9093). And again, "I didn't feel that this experience really tied into any of my academics at SCU" (125A9093).

The narrative data indicates that most of the students do make connections to their learning, but at different levels. However, the data do not indicate why the experience works for some but not for others.

Second, another theme in the responses reflects personal issues of the students. For some, their service-learning placement continued a process begun in high school service projects. For many others, this became their first insertion into a local community, especially a local community with needs. A good number of narrative responses, then, expressed satisfaction, a feeling of personal value or accomplishment, or a sense of emotional attachment. Some noted that the most important part of their experience was learning about themselves. Typical comments include statements like these: "I am very proud of my involvement at the Almaden Center. I feel I made a positive contribution to the Center" (26S95). "I learned to accept and better understand how homeless men feel and think. Also by interacting with the men I was able to obtain an entirely different perspective on life, but one that is simpler and more applicable!" (10W95B). Sometimes this personal growth focused on one or other aspect of the student's life: "I learned how to relate to people who differed in culture and social background from me" (17S95). Other times, students made a personal judgment based on the site. One, who did not care for the elder care placement, wrote, "I learned that I shall never put my parents in a retirement home" (18F96).

Overall, students seemed most aware of personal issues as they completed the narrative

evaluations. One benefit from the service-learning experience is in the area of emotional growth: a sense of self-esteem, a sense of being appreciated, a sense of satisfaction.

A third theme in the narrative evaluations grows from the emotional. Students reported a growth in empathy for those they served. This cuts across the kinds of placement as the following comments show. A student working at a nursing home wrote, "I know I learned it because I value what I have more now, and have a deeper sense of empathy for those at the convalescent hospital" (45W95B). One tutoring at an inner-city school commented, "I learned that studying hard was not the only requirement for success in school. I came from a background that gave me an advantage. Most of the people in the program had far more obstacles to graduating from high school than I ever did" (22W95B). Another student working with the homeless wrote, "I learned that the homeless are real people. I learned that sometimes things that aren't planned happen" (7A9093). Finally, someone in a community center teaching English as a second language reflected, "I better understand the attitudes and perspectives of the Hispanic person towards me and our society!" (12A9093).

This notion of relating to others runs through many of the responses. For a good number of program participants, the key idea of service learning seemed to be their ability to relate to others, particularly those different from themselves. This shows up in two, apparently different ways, seeing others as the same or seeing them as different, as the next two comments indicate: "The kids' lives and experiences were so different from mine. I enjoyed talking to them and hearing about their lives" (54F96). "They're just like you and me. They're friendly and intelligent too" (55F96). For many of the upper-middle class students at Santa Clara, this similarity to others

from different backgrounds came as a huge revelation.

Fourth, a theme of changed outlook appears in the data. This could apply either to one's outlook on others, similar to what we saw in the third theme, or to one's outlook on education or life. Here are representative comments, first dealing with judgments about people in the community centers: "My thoughts have completely changed, these kids are good and they have aspirations, they just need someone to help them meet those goals" (22S98ii). Second, about the educational enterprise: "Learning isn't all books and classes. We can learn through experiences and observations" (8A9093). The service-learning experience does work to change students.

Finally, a number of students seriously address the question about changing or improving the program. For many, this became a more difficult item to answer, since it required accepting the invitation to criticize the authority figures of the placement sites and of the University staff. One wrote about a tutoring site, "I was just amazed at the lack of respect, the vulgar language that the kids displayed. The staff didn't help much. All of us were in complete disgust! I would not recommend this site to anyone" (4S97). Another noted, "80%- 90% of the time I did office work. I don't mind helping out wherever needed, but for the purpose of this Eastside, it was not a worthwhile time commitment" (25S97). Perhaps not surprisingly, most simply noted that nothing should be changed.

The narrative data also indicates spots of program failure. In addition to the explicit suggestions students make, some directly note that they did not learn from the experience (as illustrated above). More, though, indirectly indicate some lack of learning. A telling indicator that runs through most of the 1990-1993 comments and continues to a lesser degree in the 1995-

1998 comments is that the students refer to themselves as "volunteers" and see their service-learning activities as "volunteer work." In a program that tries to separate itself from University-sponsored volunteer work, that bills itself to faculty, students, and administrators as an educational component supplementary to the classroom, this failure to explain itself is a serious issue. Another failure flag comes in the many student comments whose language reflects a sense of separation from the community through a kind of magnanimity, a "we will be good enough to help you" kind of mentality. The kinds of learning from the community envisioned by service-learning planners has not yet caught on with these students.

Survey data

In the 1992-1993 data set (N = 45), an analysis of means shows that the students tended to agree or strongly agree with almost all the questions; in fact the rates tend to be in the 70% to 90% range. The only item that falls below this is item 22 "What I learned at my placement was enhanced by classroom activities and assigned readings." Only 57% agreed with this statement, while 42% either disagree or strongly disagreed.

Of the factors, two seem most relevant to the assessment clusters identified above: the value of the experience and its influence on students' future behavior (factor 1) and the connection with student academics (factor 3). There were no significant differences between subsets of these, based on year in school or on numbers of service-learning experiences that the students had. (Unfortunately, the gender variable was corrupted, so no comparisons could be made on that basis.) However, the levels of general agreement with the items constituting factor

1 differed significantly from the levels of agreement with the items constituting factor 3. While levels of agreement were both positive, students agreed with factor 1 items 70% to 90% of the time and with factor 3 items 50% to 65% of the time. (The average mean of items in Factor 1 = 1.602; average mean of items in Factor 3 = 1.968; $t = -3.231$, $df = 31$; $p < .003$).

The 1995-1997 data set (N = 357) shows similar pattens, with students manifesting the same tendency to agree or strongly agree with most of the items, usually at the 80% to 90% rate. This set exhibits the same weaknesses as the earlier one: the items loading on factor 2, the connection with academics, consistently show lower levels of agreement (though these are still mostly above 50%). Item 16 "This experience enhanced my understanding of the subject" showed 63% agreement and 35% disagreement. Item 17 "This experience influenced the research andd/or other assignments I did for this class" had 63% agreement and 32% disagreement. Item 18 "My curiosity was engaged enough by this experience that I wanted to learn more about the issues and people related to this placement" scored 67% agreement and 31% disagreement. Item 19 "What I learned at my placement was enhanced by classroom activities and assigned readings" showed the lowest levels of agreement at 48%, with 47% disagreeing. Here, too, the levels of agreement with each factor differed significantly. (N=336. The average mean of items loading on Factor 1 = 1.858, average mean of items loading on Factor 2 = 2.266, $df = 335$, $p < .001$).

On the two key factors, the value of the experience and its influence on students' future behavior (factor 1) and the connection with academics (factor 2), there were no significant differences between subsets based on numbers of service-learning placements. However, males

and females did differ significantly on making connections with academic work, with the women (N = 258) more likely to agree than the men (N = 88) with the statements loading on factor 2 (male mean = 12.25; female mean = 11.135; t=2.274, df= 123.46, p = .025). The students also differed significantly on their agreement with those items loading on factor 1 (worth of the experience) according to year in school. Here the sophomores showed less agreement with the rest (oneway analysis of variance: freshmen N=78, mean = 12.3, sophomores N= 137, mean = 13.92; juniors N = 67, mean = 12.25; seniors N = 55, mean = 12.85. F=2.753, df = 3 (between), 333 (within), p. < .05).

Other measures

Anecdotal data from the student journals, based on an informal polling of faculty recollections, indicates that between 50% and 66% of the students do "get it," that is, do make an application of their service-learning experience to their communication course material. The more successful results come in applied courses such as journalism and reporting classes or documentary video. In each of these, the students gather data for course assignments at their placements, interviewing people and writing a feature story, for example. As one journalism teacher put it, "Even if the students hate the experience, they learn a lot of reporting skills that will serve them well when they leave school." The more general courses like the introduction to communication study or the interpersonal course show less clear-cut results. Those teachers who stress the connections and urge the students to regard their service-learning experience as a kind of participant observation report that the students do grow in the ability to recognize and record

communication behaviors. Similarly, the intercultural communication course also reports that students benefit from experiencing the variety of cultures in the Northern California milieu of the University.

Discussion

The results of the data analysis indicate several important things about assessing the service-learning component of the communication courses at Santa Clara University. The program is broadly successful, but not perfect. Four key weaknesses need addressing.

First, and perhaps most important, we cannot adequately assess the experience because we lack comparison data. While the Communication Department, the Eastside Project office, and individual faculty collected data, they did so independently and no group collected data on students who do NOT participate in service-learning activities. In the classes that use service-learning, it is required of all students, so faculty members cannot compare grades or other measures of student learning. Similarly, departmental course evaluations do not compare across classes; as they are currently implemented, too many other variables would make comparisons impossible. (For example, summer session sections do not use service-learning placements, and therefore could provide a comparison group, but summer session courses differ so dramatically from those scheduled in the regular term–number of class meetings, meeting times, class length, accelerated scheduling, etc.–that direct comparison cannot be made.) Eastside evaluations only collect data from student participants; there is nothing from those not participating.

What we can assess indicates at least one weakness in the program's implementation in

the communication curriculum at Santa Clara. Both narrative and survey data indicate that students do not make connection to their class material; they fail in the last step of service-learning: classroom reflection on the experience. Somehow the students do not make the full circle from theory (classroom) to practice (placement) to integration (reflection on practice). Faculty implementation of the service-learning model needs improvement.

Second the kinds of data collected do not address each of the six clusters of objectives of the service-learning experience: intellectual development of students, skills development of students, affective development of students, moral and spiritual growth of students, community outcomes, university outcomes. The narrative data yield five general themes that line up only partially with the clusters: (1) connection with learning, (2) personal issues, (3) empathy, (4) changes in outlook, and (5) program feedback. The survey data yield four factors that similarly align themselves only partially: (1) the value of the experience and its influence on students' future behavior, (2) connection with academics, (3) awareness of community and social issues, and (4) the initial experience at the placement.

What we have seen breaks down in this fashion.

Objectives cluster	measures
Student intellectual development	faculty grading reports student journals student self-report (Eastside survey, factor 2 or 3) Eastside narrative evaluations, theme 1
Student skills development	faculty grading reports
Student affective development	student self-report (Eastside narrative evaluations: themes 3 and 2)

Student moral, spiritual development	student self-report (nothing directly addresses this, but it may emerge indirectly)
Community outcomes	Not addressed in the current evaluations, except indirectly in the Eastside narratives, theme four. The supervisor's report may touch on some issues.
University outcomes	Not directly addressed in any evaluation instrument, but may appear indirectly in narrative comment, particularly in themes 2 and 4, and in factors 1 and 3 of the survey instrument.

The greatest value of this line up lies in its ability to indicate what we do not know. Faculty should explore ways to measure whether a service-learning placement helps in skills development and in affective development. At some point the University should investigate whether service-learning placements help its interests in the local community and the local community should ask whether its members benefit from the university commitment. At the moment we have only anecdotal evidence, as when a placement supervisor complains about the time it takes to brief students each term, questioning whether the "costs" to the placement match the "benefits" from the students' participation.

Third, the way that the data has been collected makes long-term analysis difficult. Both narrative and survey instruments have changed over the years. In some years no survey data was collected; in others, question wording changed enough to render questionable any combination of data sets.

Fourth, students have also noted that they feel over-evaluated. In some courses they complete five or six different evaluation instruments, in addition to the normal academic evaluation tools of papers, journals, and exams. Because faculty and program administrators have

not clearly explained the process to them, students have not really seen the value of the assessment and participate somewhat half-heartedly, as many of the narrative evaluations show. At the same time, students constitute the core of the service-learning assessment. In this, the University has missed out on the participation of other key players, especially the faculty, program administrators, and off-campus participants other than the supervisors. To my knowledge, no one has asked people served in the various placements what they think of the students and the students' work. Despite the claim that the students work at their placements to learn from the community, those "teachers" do not participate in evaluating student work or the University's role in the community.

Finally, we should not lose sight of the fact that the service-learning program has a good proportion of successes. Students do evaluate the program positively and self-report that they benefit. Students do show an increased interest in and commitment to the local community. The University does break down town-gown barriers. Faculty show support for the program.

We learn two things from assessment: what we should look for in student outcomes and what we should look for in program planning. The more we learn about each, the more we succeed in both.

References

Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers.* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brookhart, S. M. (1999). *The art and science of classroom assessment: The missing part of pedagogy.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (Vo. 27, No. 1). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Droge, D., & Murphy, B. O. (Eds.). (1999). *Voices of strong democracy: Concepts and models for service-learning in communication studies.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Erwin, T. D. (1991). *Assessing student learning and development: A guide to principles, goals, and methods of determining college outcomes.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fischer, C. F., & King, R. M. (1995). *Authentic assessment: A guide to implementation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-learning in today's higher education. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 3-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Soukup, P. A. (1996). Inviting others to take the helm: Service-learning and the marginated community. Paper presented at the 82nd annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA. November 1996.

Stephens, L. S. (1995). *The complete guide to learning through community service, grades K-9.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (1987). *Educational evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines.* New York: Longman.

Appendix I

Eastside Project Student Evaluation Form
[1990-1993, spacing adjusted for this reproduction]

Your participation in community placements through the Eastside Project should be a positive one both educationally and personally. In addition, this experience should enhance your understanding of the community which your placement serves.

Please complete this form to let us know about your experience this quarter. Your observations and comments will be used to improve the work of the Eastside Project in facilitating community placements for Santa Clara students.

YOUR NAME: _____ COURSE: _____

YEAR: _____ PLACEMENT: _____

1) Why did you choose this placement?

2) How much time did you spend at the placement?
Each week: Throughout the quarter:

3)How did you spend your time at this placement? List all tasks or responsibilities.

4) What percent of your time was spent in working directly with the people who this placement serves?

5) What surprised you about this placement?
The people:
The setting:
The work:

6) What was the most significant aspect of your work at this placement?

7) What did you learn from the people who you met at this placement?

8) What connections were you able to draw between your experience at this placement and your academic experience?

9) How has your understanding of the social issues changed because of your experience at this placement?

10) What helped you or could have helped you to prepare for your volunteer experience?

11) If you were to participate in this placement again, what would you do differently?

12) What could this placement do to improve students' experience?

13) Please comment on the Eastside Project's role in your placement.

Suggestions:

Appendix II

Placement-Based Assessment
Eastside Project Thoughts
[1995-1997, spacing adjusted for this reproduction]

Name _____ SS# _____
Placement _____ Date _____
This is my _____(first, second, third, etc) Eastside Project placement.

1. (a) When I arrived at this placement, my first impressions were:

(b) When I first came here, I felt the least prepared to deal with:

2. So far, as an active learner at this site, I have learned that:

3. After spending some time at this placement, my beliefs/thoughts/feelings about the people I am meeting here are changing in these ways:

4. I'm beginning to make some new connections between the content of my course _____ (name one course for which you are doing this placement), and what I'm noticing at this site, for example:

and that makes me want to have more class discussions (or write my course paper) about:

Thank you for completing this assessment.
Please take this opportunity to talk with your placement supervisor about your ideas. If you have issues about your Eastside Project learning that are not covered on this form, please contact the Eastside office immediately at 554-4549.
White copy: Faculty Yellow copy: Eastside Project Pink copy: Placement

Appendix III

Santa Clara University Eastside Project

[1993 evaluation form]

1 Gender: A. Female B. Male

2. Ethnic background : A. African - American B. *Asian/Pacific* Islander C. Caucasian

D. Hispanic E. Native American A and B. Other

3. Year in School: A. Frosh B. Sophomore C. Junior D. Senior E. Other

4. Including this quarter, how many quarters have you worked with the Eastside Project or SCAAP?
A. One B. Two C. Three D. Four E. Five or more

Please use the following key in responding to the following questions:

A = Strongly Agree B = Agree C = Disagree D = Strongly Disagree

5. It is the moral obligation for every person to protect the welfare of persons beyond his/her circle of family and friends.
6. An individual or small group of people can have an impact on a community problem.
7. Opportunities to provide service exist at all times.
8. Skills and experiences that I gain from service learning will be valuable in my career.
9. Service learning will help me develop leadership skills.
10. I worry that my skills may not be adequate in working at my placement.
11. I have some concerns for my personal safety while at my placement.
12. Service learning will challenge me to interact with diverse groups of people.
13. I have the ability to communicate with people of different races and backgrounds.
14. I am inspired by service learning to make a greater contribution to society.
15. Anyone who tries hard enough can get ahead in this world.
16. A university does not have a responsibility to encourage its students to combat social injustice.

17. The value of service learning is overestimated by most people.

18. Diversity is critical to community development; differences must be respected and sought while similarities are explored and developed.

19. My knowledge of social problems and issues is expanded through service learning work.

20. Most people on welfare are trying to beat the system.

21. I can learn a great deal about society when I take the perspective of the poor and homeless.

22. There are important lessons about human living which can only be learned through direct contact with the poor and powerless members of our society.

23. My experience with service learning will effect my choice of majors and/or careers.

24. The measure of a society's greatness rests on how the poor and vulnerable members are treated.

25. Most poor and homeless people could get a job if they tried.

Appendix IV

Santa Clara University
Eastside Project
Program Evaluation

[1992-1993 evaluation form]

General information: Answer the following questions beginning with space number

1.This evaluation is for which quarter? 1. Fall 2. Winter 3. Spring

2.Your class: 1.Freshman 2. Sophomore 3. Junior 4. Senior

3. Gender: 1. Male 2. Female

4.For this class, participation in an Eastside Project placement was: 1.Required 2. Optional

5.How many Eastside Project placements have you completed?
1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. More than four

6.I attended the orientation for this placement before I began my work. 1. Yes 2. No

7.Which option most closely reflects the amount of time per visit you spent at your placement?

1. Less than 60 mins. 2.60 90 mins. 3.90 mins. 2 hrs. 4. more than 2 hrs.

8.Which option most closely reflects the number of weeks you attended your placement?

1. Less than four 2. Four 3. Five to six 4. Seven to eight 5. More than eight

9.Which option most closely reflects the percent of time per visit you spent working directly with the people whom this agency serves.

1. less than 25% 2.25% - 49% 3.50% - 64% *4.65%* - 79% 5. 80% - 100%

Please use the following key in responding to questions 10 - 32 below:

1 = Strongly Agree 2 = Agree 3 = Disagree 4 = Strongly Disagree 5 = Not Applicable

10. During sign-ups I was able to select a placement recommended by my instructor.
The orientation was helpful *in:*

11. developing my understanding of my role at the placement.

12. reducing my anxiety about my first visit to the placement

13.I felt welcomed at this placement.

14.I would have liked more direction and supervision at my placement.

15.The staff at this placement was helpful.

16.I thought the tasks I was asked to do at this agency were worthwhile.

17.This placement provides sufficient opportunity for students to interact and become acquainted with the clients whom the agency serves.

18.I had a clear understanding about how this experience fit into the educational goals of this course.

19.This experience enhanced my understanding of the subject matter for this course.

20.This experience influenced the research and/or other assignments I did for this class.

21 .My curiosity was engaged enough by this experience that I wanted to learn more about the issues and people related to this placement.

22.What I learned at my placement was enhanced by classroom activities and assigned readings.

23.Discussion groups sponsored by the Eastside Project helped me to connect course content with my placement experience.

I liked it when these discussion groups focused on:

24. how to improve the placement experience.

25.subject matter specific to the course.

26. I would have liked to have discussion groups with people who were all working with the same population, e.g., children or elderly.

27 As a result of this experience, I feel more confident interacting with people whose race or ethnic and cultural background is different from my own.

28. As a result of this experience, I am more likely to volunteer in the community in the future.

29. Given the opportunity, I would return to this placement.

30. I would recommend this placement to other students who take this class.
31. Overall I found this to be a worthwhile experience.
32. This experience has significantly deepened my understanding of social issues and social justice.

Appendix V

Santa Clara University
Eastside Project
Program Evaluation

[1995-1997 evaluation form]

General information: Answer the following questions beginning with space number

This evaluation is for which quarter? 1. Fall 2. Winter 3. Spring

Your major:

1.Your class: 1.Freshman 2. Sophomore 3. Junior 4. Senior

2. Gender: 1. Male 2. Female

3.For this class, participation in an Eastside Project placement was: 1.Required 2. Optional

4. How many Eastside Project placements have you completed?
1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. More than four

5. How well did the experience at your placement meet your expectations? 1. Exceeded 5. Failed

6. Which option most closely reflects the amount of time per visit you spent at your placement?

1. Less than 60 mins. 2.60 90 mins. 3.90 mins. 2 hrs. 4. more than 2 hrs.

7. Which option most closely reflects the percent of time per visit you spent working directly with the people whom this agency serves.

1. less than 25% 2.25% - 49% 3.50% - 64% 4.65% - 79% 5. 80% - 100%

8. How was the level of supervision?
1. Way Too much 2. Too much 3. About right 4. Needed more 5. Too little

Please use the following key in responding to questions 10 - 32 below:

1 = Strongly Agree 2 = Agree 3 = Disagree 4 = Strongly Disagree 5 = Not Applicable

The orientation was helpful in:

9. developing my understanding of my role at the placement.

10. reducing my anxiety about my first visit to the placement
11. I felt welcomed at this placement.

12. The staff at this placement was helpful.

13. I thought the tasks I was asked to do at this agency were worthwhile.

14. This placement provides sufficient opportunity for students to interact and become acquainted with the clients whom the agency serves.

15. I had a clear understanding about how this experience fit into the educational goals of this course.

16. This experience enhanced my understanding of the subject matter for this course.

17. This experience influenced the research and/or other assignments I did for this class.

18. My curiosity was engaged enough by this experience that I wanted to learn more about the issues and people related to this placement.

19. What I learned at my placement was enhanced by classroom activities and assigned readings.

20. As a result of this experience, I feel more confident interacting with people whose race or ethnic and cultural background is different from my own.

21. As a result of this experience, I am more likely to volunteer in the community in the future.

22. Given the opportunity, I would return to this placement.

23. I would recommend this placement to other students who take this class.

24. This experience has significantly deepened my understanding of social issues and social justice.

25. Overall I found this to be a worthwhile experience.